

[Draft]

[This paper has been prepared by the EFRAG Secretariat for discussion at a public meeting of the EFRAG SRB/SR TEG. The paper does not represent the official views of EFRAG or any individual member of the EFRAG SRB or EFRAG SR TEG. The paper is made available to enable the public to follow the discussions in the meeting. Tentative decisions are made in public and reported in the EFRAG Update. EFRAG positions, as approved by the EFRAG SRB, are published as comment letters, discussion or position papers, or in any other form considered appropriate in the circumstances.](#)

Comment Letter on the GHG Protocol Actions and Market Instruments Phase 1 White Paper

[You can submit your comments on EFRAG's draft comment letter by responding to EFRAG's online survey.](#)

[Comments should be submitted by 16 May 2026.](#)

Greenhouse Gas Protocol

WRI

10 G Street NE, Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20002, U.S.A.

WBCSD

Avenue Du Bouchet 2BIS
1209 Geneva, Switzerland

[XX] May 2026

Re: EFRAG's Comment Letter to the GHG Protocol Actions and Market Instruments Phase 1 progress update (White paper)

Dear Prof. Dr. Bassen,

On behalf of EFRAG, I am writing to comment on the topics presented in the GHG Protocol ('GHGP') Actions and Market Instruments ('AMI') Phase 1 Progress Update White Paper dated March 2026 (the 'White Paper') and related request for information (RFI) issued on 31 March 2026.

This letter is intended to contribute to the GHG Protocol's due process, in consideration of the GHGP's AMI Technical Working Group ('TWG') deliberations in phase 2 towards the development of the first complete AMI draft Standard/Guidance for accounting and reporting on the impacts of actions and market instruments. It is an important consideration for EFRAG and its stakeholders given references to existing GHGP standards and guidance in ESRS E1, *Climate Change*, as well as ESRS requirements to assess and disclose material impacts – both positive and negative – arising from actions.

We acknowledge the substantial work undertaken by the GHGP so far. EFRAG welcomes the opportunity to contribute to developments that improve GHG emissions accounting and reporting at a global level, as already illustrated by our continued engagement with the GHGP across its various workstreams.

We recognise the important historical role the GHGP and its suite of voluntary standards have played in supporting various global and jurisdictional climate reporting frameworks – many of which have since transitioned from voluntary to mandatory. Our response focuses on facilitating the interaction between the ESRS and GHGP. Greater complexity in standards can be detrimental to the overall objective of empowering stakeholders to accurately, transparently, and credibly account for and report on climate actions and their impacts. We therefore encourage the GHGP to ensure that the proposed approach remains proportionate to the challenges it seeks to address, and that it is practical and accessible for all stakeholders.

The White Paper proposes a new approach for GHG emissions reporting with the introduction of a multi-statement reporting structure, primarily allowing for the reporting of mitigation actions, and their impacts, that are not currently captured by established inventory (attributional) accounting methods. At a conceptual level the proposal offers a structured approach that aims to address specific limitations of current emissions reporting, however EFRAG expresses concern on several aspects of this proposal. First we wish to

- We emphasise the need to clarify if the AMI is intended to develop new accounting rules, a broader disclosure reporting framework, or a combination of both. Second, we in this context we highlight the potential tension of introducing reporting requirements in parallel to existing, jurisdictional reporting requirements;
- We suggest that the GHGP should focus its efforts on improving GHG accounting – in particular addressing critical GHG emissions measurement. It should be very clear what is being done where, issues that stakeholders have identified as work a more urgent need. There is a risk that expanding the AMI scope too broadly diverts attention away from more pressing matters (e.g. clarifying operational boundary requirements, biogenic emissions and waste heat, and broader Scope 3 challenges).
- We encourage the GHGP to adopt a phased approach to the AMI workstream by prioritising the methodological gaps in physical and market-based inventories (statements 1 and 2 respectively) in the first instance, before progressing on detailed developments for the reporting of GHG impacts of actions risks creating confusion rather than. This approach will focus on resolving critical GHG accounting issues, reducing the risk that multiple concurring topics are developed and consulted upon, which in turn supports simplifying the GHG reporting landscape. This.
- Further consideration is because it introduces accounting and reporting concepts that have the potential to conflict with existing jurisdictional reporting standards and climate related policies, and could disrupt existing climate action practices and related use of contractual instruments. Third, in its future developments, careful consideration by the GHG Protocol and AMI TWG will be required for key aspects including: 1) the need for robust safeguards regarding the accounting and measurement of avoided emissions; and 2) needed on how the definition and role of 'physical inventory' the 'physical inventory' interacts with market instruments and traceability, including potential conflicts with EU policies (e.g., EU ETS, CBAM) and disproportionate impacts on emerging economies due to uneven data infrastructure, undermining the GHGP's goal of global applicability interaction with EU policies (e.g., EU ETS, CBAM). This will require particular attention to ensure GHGP supports local jurisdictions and remains globally applicable. We recommend careful consideration when defining 'physical traceability' and 'physical connectivity' as it relates to market-based instruments and their disclosure in GHG inventories.
- For any future developments on consequential accounting, we emphasise the need to define foundational principles, underpinned by robust measurement methodologies and

safeguards, that remain clearly separated from the physical and market-based GHG inventories that are based on attributional accounting.

It is also important to note the need for alignment with the ongoing direction of the GHGP revision, notably the proposed update to the objective statement in the Corporate Standard¹, which underlines ***the primary goal of the Corporate Standard is to help companies and other organizations to develop and maintain a relevant, complete, consistent, accurate, and transparent GHG inventory, using standardized approaches and principles, in order to (...) support more transparent and comparable reporting of GHG emissions.*** We recommend the GHGP ~~recognises~~AMI reflects this primary goal of the standard, which to our understanding focuses on emissions accounting.

Furthermore, we understand the GHGP's governance procedures, specifically its decision-making criteria and hierarchy, ranks 'feasibility to implement' as its last criterion when evaluating options in standard development and revisions, ensuring scientific integrity is not compromised. EFRAG considers this decision-making criteria should not be applied as a hierarchy but rather as principles with equal validity depending on the context. This approach would allow criteria to intersect rather than conflict with each other, allowing for more nuanced decision making.

Finally, EFRAG notes that the ~~public consultation~~RFI period provided by the GHGP is too short to allow for EFRAG to undertake a full~~carry out a~~ due process needed to develop a fully substantiated response. Consequently, EFRAG engaged in an accelerated due process within this limited timeframe, conducting outreach with European stakeholders through workshops, interviews, and input through an online survey. EFRAG has also drawn on its experience in the context of the ESRS implementation support and more recently in the ESRS simplification. ~~In this regard, we also~~Nonetheless, to ensure a meaningful response, we recommend the GHGP allows sufficient time to consult on and receive comments on standard-related developments such as the AMI White Paper, given their importance in the global emissions reporting landscape.

We would also like to extend our personal thanks to the GHG Protocol team for making themselves available to present the AMI Phase 1 White Paper (version 2.1) to the EFRAG SR TEG (and, via recording, to the EFRAG SRB) in a March 2026 public session, and for contributing to our online stakeholder workshop on 7 May 2026.

Detailed comments and responses to the GHGP's RFI are provided immediately following this cover letter, with answers organised according to the key questions and topics for feedback.

If you would like to discuss our comments further, please do not hesitate to contact Pedro Faria, [pedro.faria@efrag.org].

Yours sincerely,

Kerstin Lopatta

~~Vice~~ Chair of the EFRAG SRB

¹ Greenhouse Gas Protocol Corporate Standard Revisions Phase 1 Progress Update December 2025

EFRAG's responses to the request for information on the Greenhouse Gas Protocol Actions and Market Instruments (AMI) Phase 1 Progress Update (White Paper)

Improvements to proposed multi-statement reporting structure [RFI Question 18]

1. Conceptually, the proposed new multi-statement emissions reporting structure can be useful to address common accounting issues and user needs and, subsequently, can, in a second step, also improve reporting of GHG information. It presents a structured approach seeking to address a gap in inventory-based GHG accounting, where the disclosure of GHG impacts from actions and investments that reduce global emissions lack a common accounting and reporting framework making it difficult to quantify, communicate, and compare emissions. EFRAG Secretariat recognises some conceptual Conceptual advantages of the multi-statement accounting framework may include: 1) it can help to preserve preserving the integrity of corporate GHG emissions inventories, while separately incentivising climate actions by and clarifying how their impacts are accounted and reported for; 2) it can increase increasing transparency around procurement and contractual instruments; and 3) it creates creating a structured approach for consequential accounting of climate actions. Notwithstanding the potential for these conceptual advantages to be realised. However, there is a concern that by emphasising this as a new 'reporting structure' rather than the development of new accounting requirements, it may conflict with existing mandatory reporting standards. This issue warrants particular attention in the future development of the AMI Standard/Guidance.
2. Clarifying and ensuring that the preparation of a corporate GHG inventory based on well-established attributional accounting methods remains remain the foundation for corporate emissions reporting is key to preserving the integrity of based scope 1, 2, and 3 emissions reporting is critical. The GHG Protocol GHGP Corporate Standard to date has seen wide global adoption, forming the basis of many national and jurisdictional GHG emission reporting standards and frameworks that are key for the transition to a climate-neutral economy. Whilst broadening Broadening the scope of corporate emissions reporting to address gaps in inventory-based GHG accounting, it the GHGP standards and guidance should not diminish the importance of a robust GHG emissions inventory it which should be the priority. It must be clear that there cannot be any accounting and reporting on climate actions, without first properly accounting for and reporting a GHG emissions inventory. Likewise, reporting on impacts of climate actions should needs to be voluntary, carefully aligned preceded with existing mandatory standards and framed in such a way that it does not conflict with existing jurisdictional emissions reporting disclosure requirement such as the ones in ESRS. Strengthening a robust accounting and reporting of GHG emissions inventory should be the priority.
3. Preliminary discussions with members of the EFRAG SRB and SR TEG Stakeholders indicated that the AMI can be perceived as extending the GHGP scope in a highlighted concerns that elements of the White Paper appear to represent a reporting and disclosure framework, rather than an emissions accounting standard. Whilst a more structured approach to the reporting of GHG impacts and the development of consequential accounting methods may be needed, it is important that this is not conflated with a complete restructure of the way in which emissions are currently reported in corporate GHG inventories. To this extent, we recognise a risk of tension with existing mandatory requirements in local jurisdictions, should the GHG Protocol's work shift closer or extensively to GHG reporting. In this case, particular attention should be taken on how it can articulate with existing mandatory reporting standards. As such, the GHG Protocol should concentrate its efforts on providing standards and guidance that directly address GHG accounting matters in a way that facilitates the ease of adoption by existing corporate sustainability disclosure standards. This is also in line with

~~tentative direction of GHGP Corporate Standard revision that highlights the primary goal of helping companies and other organizations to develop and maintain a relevant, complete, consistent, accurate, and transparent GHG inventory.~~

- ~~4.3. Similarly, the proposition has been perceived by most stakeholders as extending the GHGP scope in~~ horizontal manner rather than vertically addressing the challenges of accounting. Given the variety of complex technical GHG accounting issues that are concurrently being explored by the ~~GHG Protocol~~GHGP and other initiatives, EFRAG recommends that the ~~GHG Protocol~~GHGP maintains a focus on thematic areas of most importance such that attention is not diverted away from what some stakeholders believe are more important technical matters to be solved. For example, accounting for biogenic emissions or waste heat, ~~updates to scope~~broader Scope 3 ~~categories~~challenges, and ~~simplifying~~clarifying operational boundary requirements (some of which, we acknowledge, are already part of GHGP workstreams). Adopting a phased approach to the development of the proposed statements in the AMI White Paper, by prioritising the physical and market-based inventories could help ensure attention remains focussed on critical GHG accounting issues. We view this as a priority, in preference to allocating resources simultaneously to develop a comprehensive consequential accounting statement, as is currently proposed in the AMI White Paper.
4. Similarly, the development of any new reporting requirements in the current context, where interconnected sustainability and climate standards are being developed concurrently, risks further complexifying the emissions reporting. The White Paper proposes addressing a number of cross-cutting technical issues, which have relevance across the suite of GHGP's standards and guidance, not solely the AMI workstream. The focus should therefore be on addressing priority GHG accounting issues in a coordinated way whilst seeking alignment and consolidation with ongoing standard developments, including within the GHG Protocol and more broadly (e.g. CSRD, SBTi, ISO).
5. Maintaining consistency and coherence of reporting boundaries established across ~~reporting~~ statements is important for transparency, comparability, and an overall coherent reporting architecture. Additionally the connectivity between an organisation's sustainability statement and financial statement ~~and the ability to reconcile actions with impacts is particularly relevant to organisations reporting in line with existing disclosure standards and frameworks is critical for companies that want to ensure consistency with their financial statements.~~ Whether the proposed new statements in the White Paper could be adopted by existing reporting standards is ~~a key factor for the operationalisation of the AMI Standard/Guidance. It will also be important for the GHG Protocol to clarify whether each statement or individual elements within statements are deemed to be prerequisites for reporting in other statements, as well as further clarity on the potential linkages between the reporting statements themselves~~key for the operationalisation of the AMI Standard.

Agreement with Purpose, Goals and Objectives [RFI Question 21]

6. While the ~~purpose of the~~GHGP Corporate Standard ~~is to provide~~provides requirements and guidance for companies and other organisations in preparing a corporate-level ~~greenhouse gas (GHG)~~ emissions (physical) inventory, the AMI White Paper ~~defines its purpose~~ isas to enable companies to account and report on climate actions not reflected in the physical inventory. In this sense, the two are highly complementary and distinct. The outlined purpose, goals and objectives presented in the White Paper however extend beyond existing concepts in the Corporate, Scope 2 and Scope 3 standards. ~~This may significantly impact areas connected to the reporting and perception of (negative and positive) climate (and other) impacts.~~

7. The proposed purpose, goals and objectives in AMI revision refer both to requirements to account and report and the difference between these concepts is not clearly articulated. Stakeholder feedback highlighted concerns that elements of the White Paper appear to represent a reporting and disclosure framework, rather than an emissions accounting standard. Whilst a more structured approach to the reporting of GHG impacts and the development of consequential accounting methods may be needed, it is important that this is not conflated with a complete restructure of the way in which emissions are currently reported in corporate GHG inventories. To this extent, we recognise a risk of tension, overlap and risk of introducing additional burden concurrent to existing mandatory requirements in local jurisdictions should the GHGP's work shift closer or extensively to GHG reporting. EFRAG Secretariat strongly recommends that the GHGP continues to serve as the foundational standard for focus on accounting rules, while explicitly acknowledging the role of local jurisdictions in setting additional or complementary reporting requirements. This, in order to facilitate alignment with and adoption by corporate sustainability disclosure standards. Clarifying this approach ensures will ensure global consistency, while avoiding excessive reporting burden for companies and allowing for necessary regional adaptation.

7-8. EFRAG recognises the important historical role of the GHGP in supporting multiple GHG emissions reporting initiatives programmes, many of which have since evolved from voluntary to mandatory reporting requirements. This evolution should inform be taken into account in how the GHGP defines the its scope and requirements of its standards, including whether AMI concepts should be integrated or not into the Corporate Standard suite.

9. ~~It is also important to note the need of~~ We also underline the general need of alignment with the other GHG Protocol standards and guidance as essential element to maintain consistency, comparability and usability. Currently, the interaction between different workstreams is not clearly articulated. Due consideration should also be given to how the AMI developments will complement or impact ongoing revisions by the GHGP, in particular the GHG Corporate Standard, Scope 2 Standard, and the new Land Sector and Removals Standard.

8-10. In particular, we consider important alignment with the ongoing direction of GHGP revision, notably the proposed update to the objective statement in the Corporate Standard², which underlines ***the primary goal of the Corporate Standard is to help companies and other organizations to develop and maintain a relevant, complete, consistent, accurate, and transparent GHG inventory, using standardized approaches and principles, in order to (...) support more transparent and comparable reporting of GHG emissions.*** We recommend the GHGP recognises this primary goal of the standard, which to our understanding focuses on emissions accounting.

Market-based GHG inventory Statement [RFI Question 23]

9. The separation of market-based ~~/contractually related~~ GHG emissions from the accounting and reporting of scope 1, 2, and 3 emissions (and removals) introduces not only a new approach, but a relatively new- and narrative in corporate emissions accounting and reporting defined as: the 'physical inventory'. ~~This is closely~~ linked to the concept of 'physical traceability', ~~an area which we note the AMI will seek to define in phase 2 of the AMI standard development process. The ability to physically trace emission data throughout the value chain is complex, requiring multifaceted systems, processes and technologies. The definition of 'physical traceability' will therefore need careful consideration such that there is a common understanding of the term, including clear eligibility criteria for traceability mechanisms, such as chain of custody models.~~

10-11. The current proposal in the AMI White Paper will separate. Separating market instruments which are unable to that cannot demonstrate physical traceability – notably RECs, GOs and

² [Greenhouse Gas Protocol Corporate Standard Revisions Phase 1 Progress Update December 2025](#)

similar instruments when the physical traceability requirements are not met – from the physical inventory (scope 1, 2 and 3 emissions) by including them within the (attributional) contractual GHG inventory. This represents a significant accounting change that has the potential to considerably could disrupt corporate climate action practices.

12. EFRAG recognises the current proposal as a middle-ground approach: it clarifies the distinction between physical inventory accounting and contractual accounting, which is a useful step for conceptual clarity within the Corporate Standard, while still allowing for the practice of 'contractual accounting'. It physically tracing emissions throughout the value chain is complex, requiring multiple systems, processes and technologies. The definition of 'physical traceability' and 'physical connectivity' therefore needs careful consideration to ensure a common understanding, including clear eligibility and quality criteria for traceability mechanisms (e.g. mass balance and other chain of custody models), and clarity on transparency and audit trails required for market instruments to qualify under AMI statements.

13. EFRAG acknowledges that this approach prepares the (conceptual) ground for the Corporate Standard to accommodate other market instruments related to Scopes 1 and 3, which the market has long advocated for (e.g. use of market instruments for the accounting of biogas, green hydrogen or sustainable aviation fuel (SAF)). However, it also adds complexity to corporate accounting and reporting, potentially disrupting existing practices. The feasibility of separately reporting physical and perceptions of corporate climate impacts, market-based emissions, and implications across sectors, must be considered. EFRAG requests clarification on whether AMI aims to create multiple GHG inventories, add reporting statements, or modify the inventory structure to separately account for emissions and actions (e.g. use of market instruments), enabling different reporting treatments.

11-14. Furthermore, the development of multiple reporting statements can conflict with existing climate-related policies, standards, and initiatives, as well as impact emissions target setting and progress reporting. The White Paper departs significantly from current practice for scope 2 emissions, where location and/or market-based emissions are reported within a single inventory. New requirements would also affect the reporting of scope 1 and 3 market instruments. Similar risks concerns were highlighted during the GHG Protocol's recent publicised in the GHGP Scope 2 consultation on revisions to its scope 2 guidance, where various stakeholders commented on the potential impacts of introducing a regarding deliverability criterion for market-based scope 2 reporting (the notion of 'criteria' ('physical connectivity')). In this regard, we therefore emphasise the importance of alignment between the GHG Protocol's reporting standards as they develop and the need for consistency.

15. Additionality is important for ensuring climate impact and integrity. Clear definitions will be key to avoid sustaining markets for contractual instruments once cost parity is achieved. Without such criteria, market instruments may compete with direct decarbonisation without delivering additional benefits. EFRAG notes that traditional additionality concepts may be less applicable in mature, cost-competitive markets and suggests distinguishing between levels of climate impact rather than relying on binary tests. Alternatively, climate impact criteria could be set by local policy frameworks.

12-16. While the concept of traceability is not a new concept, its role in the context of corporate GHG emissions accounting and reporting it represents an evolving space has evolved significantly. In addition to the GHG Protocol's interaction with existing initiatives that are working on traceability in GHG accounting (e.g. ISO, Value Chain Initiative, Task Force for Corporate Action Transparency), there is opportunity for the GHG Protocol to also VCI, TCAT). GHGP could consider relevant jurisdictional regulations and programs. In the EU there are a number of several regulations where already require supply chain transparency on products, emissions, and environmental impacts are already or soon to be required. Examples include

~~the Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism (e.g. CBAM), EU Methane Regulation, and Critical Raw Materials Act.~~ As ~~part of the~~ AMI phase 2 ~~development process, due develops,~~ consideration should be given to the potential policy implications that the ~~proposed~~ AMI Standard may give rise to, ~~as well as the intended tools required to demonstrate 'physical' traceability,~~ whilst ~~at the same time also~~ seeking opportunities to align on key concepts, safeguards, and quality criteria ~~where relevant. EFRAG Secretariat flags the need to carefully analyse potential implications and consistency with the existing EU policies and programmes (e.g. EU ETS, CBAM), as well as the intended tools GHGP will require to demonstrate 'physical' traceability.~~

GHG impact statement [RFI Question 29]

~~17. EFRAG acknowledges the need for a structured approach to standardise the way in which how emissions impacts from actions and interventions are accounted. This can improve transparency and comparability. However, the underlying details of the any proposed consequential accounting methods will need careful consideration, and the significant challenges raised by consequential accounting must be recognised; the high-degree of judgement and subjectivity involved in counterfactual calculations which can lead to significant variance in outputs, thus weakening comparability, credibility and decision-usefulness.~~

~~13-18. Notwithstanding EFRAG's overarching recommendation that the AMI workstream adopts a phased approach, we emphasise the need to ensure that any accounting standard on GHG impacts of actions: 1) defines foundational principles to that enable future comparability of measurement methodologies, tailored to local conditions and priorities; 2) provides clear examples and objectives for each reporting statement categories to support adoption and uptake; and 3) develops robust measurement methodologies, ensuring the integrity and transparency whilst navigating the complex measurement challenges associated with a broad range of decarbonisation actions. Together these elements can also improve the visibility of decarbonisations investments beyond the value chain that currently lack agreed accounting approaches (e.g. Carbon Dioxide Removal).~~

~~14. EFRAG acknowledges that these elements will form part of phase 2 of the AMI's standard development process. Nevertheless, the considerable challenges raised by consequential accounting must be recognised: the high-degree of judgement and subjectivity involved in counterfactual calculations leads to significant variance in outputs across companies and sectors, weakening comparability, credibility and decision-usefulness for users.~~

~~15. Therefore we recommend:~~

~~19. A focus on We recommend the following:~~

~~a) A set of accounts to hold the consequential GHG impacts of actions should be an optional feature of the GHG inventory, separated from the physical and market-based GHG inventories based on attributional accounting. Requiring its reporting – or not – and how to report on it should be left to the jurisdictional reporting standards.~~

~~a)b) Methodologies that assess global impacts: While are prioritised: while the current categories are included for comprehensiveness and to establish the requirements for credible, accounting of emissions and removals, reporting on all options would be impractical, undermine comparability, and drive unnecessary complexity. We expect that the AMI Standard would not require to report on all such options and recommend that consequential accounting should prioritise methodologies that assess global impacts of actions – whether related to the investment, development or sales of specific products (see below on avoided emissions) and services, or interventions all categories.~~

~~b)c) Mitigate risks of one-sided reporting: the GHG impact statement aims to account AMI proposes accounting for and report reporting on both positive and negative GHG~~

impacts of actions, but there is a risk of greenwashing if organisations selectively disclose only positive impacts, thus also potentially obscuring information on any adverse impacts from actions ~~taken~~. Clear guidance, criteria and safeguards are needed to avoid ~~a bias — perceived or otherwise —~~ and ensure balanced and ~~decision~~ useful disclosures.

~~e)d)~~ Align with ESRS requirements: careful consideration is required to avoid contradictions with ~~the ESRS requirements. ESRS, which~~ explicitly prohibits the netting of positive and negative impacts ~~when assessing materiality.~~ If avoided emissions are presented ~~in a separate statement but placed separately~~ alongside the physical inventory, the risk of aggregated reading — i.e. ‘our net balance is positive’ — is significant ~~in both financial and sustainability communications~~, and as such in direct contradiction with ~~the ESRS requirements.~~

~~e)e)~~ Adopt a holistic approach: ~~Quantifying standardised quantification of~~ actions and impacts both within and beyond the value chain ~~in a standardised way is a welcome development towards supports~~ a more holistic approach for ~~the~~ disclosure of systemic positive and negative impacts. ~~However, however~~ robust safeguards are essential to prevent shifting focus away from negative impacts. Special consideration is needed for trade-offs between impacts on different topics ~~— this is, for example, (e.g. actions that may have positive climate impacts but negatively impact biodiversity (or vice versa) —),~~ and how to reflect this in ~~terms of a GHG-only accounting and reporting framework.~~

~~e)f)~~ ~~Balance new developments with existing practices~~ Avoided emissions: EFRAG ~~recognises notes mixed views on avoided emissions. While some stakeholders recognise~~ a market need for ~~the their~~ accounting ~~of avoided emissions~~ (e.g. from the use of sold products), ~~concerns remain regarding methodological robustness, comparability, and appreciates its separation from the physical GHG inventory. Quantifying the positive impacts and benefits associated with avoided emissions was identified by stakeholders during the 2025 ESRS revision, including suggestions received to define avoided emissions, include their disclosure alongside GHG removals and storage, and clarify their interaction with target setting. However the appropriateness of dedicated guidance. Should such guidance be developed,~~ successful implementation ~~should be~~ subject ~~to would~~ require: 1) robust ~~methodological guidance, which should methodologies,~~ often ~~be developed~~ ~~ped~~ at the jurisdictional level; and 2) ~~consideration and alignment with existing standards and, guidance on avoided emissions and Product Carbon Footprint (PCF) methodologies (for example approaches (e.g. ISO 14067:2018 Greenhouse gases — Carbon footprint of products, the WBCSD Guidance on Avoided Emissions or the Avoided Emissions Framework (AEF) of Mission Innovation);),~~ to ensure consistency and transparency and avoid fragmented practices.

~~f)g)~~ Careful consideration of ~~pitfalls:~~ avoided emissions ~~pitfalls:~~ ~~Quantitative figures on avoided emissions metrics can be particularly provide relevant in the context of complementary information, particularly in forward-looking narratives exploring transition pathways compatible with the on~~ transition to a sustainable economy ~~and with limiting global warming to 1.5°C in line with the Paris Agreement, and are frequently considered as a complementary disclosure by companies.~~ However, they ~~can also lead to present risks of greenwashing and systemic double-counting, particularly as issues related to the allocation of avoided emissions between across value chain actors are is typically not addressed by existing quantification methodologies. For example, if Company A sells a low-carbon product to Company B, both parties may claim the same avoided emissions; Company A as GHG impacts of sold products, and Company B as Scope 3 downstream substitution. In the absence of a registry of rights over avoided emissions, comparable to carbon credit registries, double-counting is both inevitable and undetectable at an aggregated level. The AMI phase 2 EFRAG notes mixed views on this point form its stakeholders, but supports further work should seek to address this~~

double counting of avoided emissions and ensure transparent and consistent allocation problem explicitly before any reporting option is formalised of claims.

Non-GHG Indicators [RFI Question 32]

20. EFRAG questions the necessity of including non-GHG indicators ~~in as part of the upcoming proposed statements in the AMI White paper.~~ The GHGP has played significant role in the provision of standards and guidance that have shaped the global GHG emissions accounting and reporting environment. ~~With reference to EFRAG's previous comments on this matter, we question the current need for the GHGP to develop a statement dedicated to non-GHG metric indicators.~~ The proposed 'Statement 4' appears to depart from the setting of standardised GHG accounting rules and rather seeks to introduce specific reporting requirements that, although complement an organisation's overall climate reporting, are perhaps better housed outside of the ~~GHGP suite of standards and guidance, proposed AMI Standard/Guidance.~~ This position further underlines EFRAG's feedback that the AMI workstream should remain focussed on addressing GHG accounting matters and related technical issues as a priority.

21. Whilst we acknowledge that some stakeholders are supportive of including a statement on non-GHG indicators, in particular as it can provide relevant contextual information on climate and decarbonisation progress outside of traditional GHG reporting metrics, we question its global applicability, and therefore uptake, primary due to the following:

16.a) _____ The ESRS already foresee the reporting of other indicators closely associated with GHG emissions, namely energy use associated to GHG emissions or future CapEx and OpEx needs related to planned climate mitigation actions. Other reporting standards and frameworks, including the EU Taxonomy and ISSB Sustainability Standards, also define non-GHG indicators (financial and non-financial) and as such their inclusion as part of the proposed AMI reporting structure could be seen as duplicative.

b) _____ ~~Additionally the~~ The development of sector-agnostic metrics with universal applicability would be a significant challenge given the industry, jurisdictional, and often company-level specific nature of such indicators. Companies often develop business relevant metrics internally, including on sustainability topics, to track performance and support decision making.

17.c) _____ There are already initiatives and frameworks emerging that address best practice corporate climate action and disclosures that may be better placed to develop guidance on a more structured approach to reporting on climate mitigation actions and progress, separate to GHG accounting. For example, the Gold Standard Climate Responsibility Framework and WWF's Blueprint for Corporate Action on Climate and Nature.

Other comments [RFI Question 33]

18-22. In developing the AMI Standard project, we also highlight the importance of balancing the need for transparency whilst considering the likelihood of adoption of new reporting options being proposed. To understand expected uptake of AMI accounting and reporting, the GHGP should check market appetite and readiness for disclosing this new information within the context of existing global reporting demands. ~~EFRAG emphasises the need to ensure a proportionate response to the core challenge the AMI is seeking to address, and recommends a cost-benefit analysis is undertaken specific to the AMI workstream. We recommend undertaking an adequate cost-benefit analysis to ensure that provisions chosen in the future standard deliver greatest value relative to the efforts required.~~ This analysis would serve as a useful input alongside prior insights received during the GHGP's global stakeholder survey and consultation in 2023, and the results of current stakeholder feedback on the AMI phase

1 White Paper. Acknowledging the highly technical nature of the AMI's proposed phase 2 work, it may be concluded that certain elements are prioritised (e.g. agreeing consequential accounting methods) whilst others are reconsidered. EFRAG reiterates its recommendation to consider phasing in certain provisions in order to reduce the implementation challenges.

~~19. With reference to concurrent revisions to other GHGP's, due consideration should be given to how the AMI Standard developments will complement or impact these revisions, in particular the GHG Corporate Standard, Scope 2 Standard, and the new Land Sector and Removals Standard.~~

23. TheWe also support the sector-agnostic approach taken by the AMI and its purpose to provide a "standard that can be used as a foundation for sector-specific requirements and guidance". Further, EFRAG recommends that flexibility is allowed for industry specific requirements and constraints by deferring to and coordinating with external developments where relevant. For example, established sector frameworks and guidance in the building sector (EPRA sBPR, GRESB and CRREM) and transport and logistics (Smart Freight Centre GLEC and MBM frameworks). In the absence of a full pilot testing period following the proposed release of the AMI Standard, EFRAG emphasises the importance of gathering a broad selection of use cases as part of its Phase 2 workstream to better understand the practical application and implications of the AMI Standard across industry sectors.

~~20-24.~~ Lastly, we note the White Paper provides a summary of the AMI's TWG discussions, however we note provides limited information on the justification for decisions taken on the approach and proposed content of the multi-statement GHG reporting structure. Whilst we acknowledge it is a White Paper and not a draft standard, greater transparency on the GHGP's process and decision-making by publishing a detailed basis for conclusions (or similar) alongside future updates would be a welcome addition to improve the understanding of the overall direction and underlying rationale for inclusions.

Important questions for AMI to address [RFI Question 34]

~~21-25.~~ Other questions that the phase 2 AMI paper may want to consider include:

- a) Which traceability requirements and criteria to adopt? What is their impact on the accounting of specific market instruments under the scope 1, 2 and 3 categories? And how will they interact with existing policy/regulatory rules?
- ~~b) Should the standard focus solely on climate mitigation actions, or also address adaptation and climate financing?~~
- ~~e)b)~~ What are the potential impacts of conceptual clarifications on the Corporate Standard and current accounting/reporting practices for scope 1, 2, and 3 emissions?
- ~~d)c)~~ How should the standard address trade-offs between: 1) Local vs. global impacts of actions, and; 2) Climate vs. non-climate impacts (e.g., biodiversity, social outcomes)?
- ~~e)d)~~ How can the standard evolve GHG accounting and reporting practices while balancing:
1) The need for conceptual clarity; 2) The risk of increased complexity. [EFRAG considers this will require strong engagement with the GHG accounting community, with further consultations/engagement moments and transparent consideration of stakeholder feedback].